DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 598 CS 505 184

AUTHOR VerLinden, Jay G.
TITLE Ethical Guidelines for Students Completing the Interpersonal Communication Course.
PUB DATE 10 Nov 85
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; College Students; Decision Making; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; *Guidelines; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Moral Values; Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum

ABSTRACT

Because a review of the literature concerning interpersonal communication ethics indicates that communication ethics are rarely discussed explicitly in interpersonal communication textbooks, there is a need for clear guidelines appropriate for individuals who have completed interpersonal communication courses. The following are among seven ethical guidelines appropriate for students who have completed an interpersonal communication course: (1) communication is more ethical when the communicator acknowledges and demonstrates sensitivity to the humanity of all participants, (2) those with instruction in interpersonal communication have an ethical responsibility to actively use their knowledge and skills to humanize their relationships with others and to actively avoid dehumanizing others, and (3) those with instruction in interpersonal communication have the ethical responsibility, when possible, to develop methods to communicate humanely in advance of an encounter. Although these guidelines are not always easy to follow, they assume that people can learn from their mistakes and call for people to acknowledge their behavior, take responsibility for it, and improve it. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265598

Ethical Guidelines for Students Completing the Interpersonal Communication Course

Jay G. VerLinden
Department of Speech Communication
432 Oldfather
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0329

A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Instructional Development Division.

November 10, 1985

Abstract

Communcation ethics are rarely discussed explicitly in Interpersonal Communication textbooks. This paper assess Speech Communication literature concerning interpersonal communication ethics and suggests seven ethical guidelines appropriate for individuals who have completed interpersonal communication courses.

CS 505 184

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jay G. VerLinden
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ethical Guidelines for Students Completing the Interpersonal Communication Course

John Condon says, "No attempt to describe what we feel interpersonal communication is can be fully separated from what we feel interpersonal communication ought to be."[1] Perhaps that explains why so little attention is given to the subject of ethics in interpersonal communication text books; the authors may believe that by explaining what is known about interpersonal communication and "how to do it" they are, at the same time, describing what it ought to be.

A survey of twenty interpersonal communication textbooks reveals only two that have ethics mentioned in either the table of contents or the index.[2] That does not mean, of course, that the authors gave no consideration to ethics when writing the books; only that the subject was not treated explicitly in the text. The lack of an explicitly stated position concerning ethics in interpersonal textbooks is analogous to the lack of such a position in public speaking texts. Although students may be told what to do to become better public speakers, unless the ethics of public speaking are articulated, the standard of what is "better" is effectiveness at meeting the speaker's goals. In interpersonal communication students may believe that what they do is right as long as it meets their individual desires. They are free to engage in any behavior because there is no good reason presented to do otherwise. A reading of most interpersonal communication texts reveals an implicit ethical position but that position is likely to go unrecognized by the students until it is made explicit.[3]

Even in those texts where ethics are treated the results are unsatisfactory. Condon's chapter on ethics[4] presents a mixture of ethical considerations and practical concerns in interpersonal communication. Topics included in his list of what is ethical in interpersonal communication is candor, social harmony, fidelity of message, deception, acknowledgment, consistency of word and act, keeping confidence and sharing, and access to secrets and invasion of privacy. While the value of fidelity (transmitting messages clearly), for example, is certainly of practical worth it is difficult to understand why an issue of competence is an ethical concern. That which is pragmatically efficient is not necessarily ethically right.

Joesph DeVito's discussion of ethics[5] is no better than Condon's. Granted, his text is not strictly an interpersonal communiction text, so his task in discussing ethics may be somewhat broader. He discusses the issues of freedom of expression, ghostwriting, behavioral conditioning, and the prevention of interaction by presenting examples of situations when ethical choices are needed and leaving the student to decide what is and is not ethical. Such a method is pedagocially acceptable as far as it goes but that is where DeVito stops. He does not present any kind of an ethical position at all.

One of the texts that has no mention of ethics in the contents or index, Brown and Keller's Monologue to Dialogue,[6] is often cited for the ethical position it takes when discussing interpersonal communication.[7] The chapter that is specifically cited can be read to take an ethical position. That position, however, is imbedded within a discussion of possible types of interpersonal communication ranging

from monologue, to technical dialogue, to resistant communication, to confrontation, to dialogue. While the authors clearly believe dialogical communication is preferable their message can be too easily read to say it is preferable as a practical matter rather than on ethical grounds.

A clear ethical position in a textbook is important to the authors who write the texts, to the instructors who will teach the course, and to the students who will read the book. For the authors and the teachers the ethical position is important because it guides their choices. The subject of interpersonal communication is far too broad for any one text or class to cover everything. An author who can clearly articulate what (s)he believes interpersonal communication ought to be can make choices of what to include in the text based on how best to achieve that ideal. The instructor choosing a text can make the choice based in part on that ethical position and can structure the class to strive for that ideal.

In some manner authors and teachers already consider their ethical philosophy when writing and choosing texts. The explicit articulation of ethical guidelines is most important to students who are unlikely to consider the ethical implictions of what they read unless those implications are clearly presented to them. Those students will engage in interpersonal communication virtually every day for the rest of their lives. Their interpersonal choices will affect not only themselves but also their families, co-workers, business subordinates, students, and strangers in unpredictably profound ways. The knowledge they gain in the interpersonal communication class adds to their

personal power in the sense that they know more about how their behavior can affect others. What they have learned in the interpersonal communication class can be used to improve their relationships and the lives of others or it can be used to manipulate and hurt others. The negative effects are all the more sinister because they can occur unintentionally; thoughtless communication can be just as harmful to others as purposeful injury. Students need, therefore, ethical guidance to serve them both in cases when clear ethical choices must be made and at times when the ethical issue is not apparent.

An explicit discussion of ethics can also serve as a reminder that actions have value. Communication may seem neutral but we communicate both about the subject and about the other person. Acts that are habitual or traditional may seem innocuous but can be detrimental to others.

Some might argue that ethical guidelines should not be spelled out in a text on the basis of the students' freedom of choice. The author has no claim to absolute truth so (s)he is obliged to avoid pronouncements. Some may further argue that, in order for the students to internalize ethical standards, they should draw the conclusions about what is or is not justified on their own. Therefore, presenting situations and asking questions is all the author need do.

The students' freedom to choose, however, does not deny an author's (or teacher's) freedom to advocate a position. Advocating a position need not involve pronouncements; it can be clearly stating the position and the reasoning supporting it. The students' freedom of choice would be protected if the author tries to ethically persuade

them to accept a particular position without declaring they would be necessarily wrong if they did not accept the position. The lack of absolute knowledge should not prevent the author from advocating a position that seems, given careful consideration of what is known, to be the most desirable.

The usefulness of students working out their own ethical systems as a pedagogic device does not preclude the advocacy of a set of standards by any author. After the students have had the opportunity to clarify their ethical positions guidelines drawn from other thinkers can be usefully presented. It would be unrealistic to believe that students in an introductory interpersonal communiation class would have the breadth or depth of knowledge that would allow them to carefully consider ethical positions. An author's advocacy could be used to augment the students' thinking rather than supplant it completely.

This paper will suggest ethical guidelines appropriate for students completing interpersonal communication courses. These standards are intended to apply to those who have received some instruction in interpersonal communication because it seems unfair to hold those with no background in the field to the same standards as those with some interpersonal education. I will first review the literature concerning interpersonal communication ethics, then suggest a series of ethical standards that would be appropriate for interpersonal communication.

LITERATURE

Although the interpersonal communication texts offer little help in ethical guidance there have been several articles written that may be more useful. For the sake of discussion I will divide the literature into four categories: (1) those that appear to have a rhetorical basis, (2) those that appeal to some overriding standard, (3) those with a contextual basis, and (4) those with a human basis for ethical choice.

Ethical standards that have a rhetorical basis are those that base choice on effectiveness. This type is most commonly encountered as an implicit ethic in interpersonal texts. Effectiveness is usually conceived as how well the message is transmitted and received. Topics such as the communication process, perception, language, nonverbal communication, and listening are covered in an attempt to make the students better communicators. "Better communicators" usually means that they are more skillful at sending and receiving messages so there is less misunderstanding.

The problem with the rhetorically based ethics is the reason for becoming a "better communictor" is unclear. While an opening chapter may discuss how communication is vital to establishing and maintaining relationships it is usually assumed that such goals are altruistically accepted by the reader. They usually do not discuss <u>why</u> better relationships are desirable beyond being personally satisfying. If they do make an argument about the worth of improved relations it usually takes the form of enhanced social harmony or greater productivity in the work place. While those practical concerns may be desirable they

leave the impression that "If I'm personally satisfied, or in harmony with those around me, or the people I work with are producing well, I'm doing what I ought to in my interpersonal communication." Those same goals can be achieved through deceit and manipulation, however, even though the texts' authors would not agree that deceit and manipulation are ethical. Thus, the rhetorical basis for ethics does not provide enough guidance in what ought to be in interpersonal communication.

A basis for ethics resides in overriding standards when some ideal that is conceived as more important than the interactants is strived for. Religious precepts traditionally comprise the standards beyond men to which men should adhere. In public speaking freedom of expression and democracy are common ideals used to ground ethical standards.

In the literature concerning interpersonal ethics there are three overriding standards discussed. Ernest Bormann's[8] standard for what is ethical in interpersonal and small group communication is the communicator's adherance to the "rules" of the game. Those who use the rules to help the group are worthy of praise, those who abuse the rules for selfish gain are targets of blame. Frank Dance[9] upholds twin standards of "the spoken word" and "truth" to guide ethics of communication. "Spoken language entails a moral imperative," he says, "an ethical imperative to the individual speaker to be TRUTHFUL."[10] He goes on to say, "The spoken word must never be acepted as incidental or peripheral, but demands to be heard and known as central, to the development and expression of all human morality and ethics."[11]

Kenneth Andersen[12] takes the position that communication is what makes us human so communication ethics should be centered around acts that will encourage and improve present and future communication.

There is nothing wrong with such overriding standards as far as they go but they do not go very far. Dance and Andersen do more to argue the importance of speech communication as a discipline than provide a compelling basis for ethical choice. Bormann's ethic is simply founded on people's reactions to the behavior of others; selfishness is unethical because when it is discovered group members condemn it. Apparently selfishiness and manipulation are acceptable if one is able to get away with it. The ethics based on idealistic overriding standards are better than no ethics and add to our conception of what ethics we should hold but are inadequate by themselves.

A contextual ethic is promoted primarily by Ronald Arnett.[13] ". . . what is ethical," he claims,

> often depends on one's perception of the contextual requirements or as Hart and others suggest, a rhetorical sensitivity. In accordance with this view, this paper is grounded in the assumption that one's perception of what is ethically appropriate in a given interpersonal communication context is influenced by <u>one's openness to transactional information about self and other and a sensitive search for the "valuable good" consequence</u>, whether or not in accordance with the notions of self-actualization and expression of human feelings.[14]

This contextual ethic recognizes that the "valuable good" may not coincide with the individual's own desires and a communicator may have to act in a manner that causes personal harm in order to provide benefit for others.

The flaw in the contextual ethic is it does not provide enough guidance for deciding what is the valuable good in difficult situations. While Arnett does not succumb to pure relativism his position that an individual's perception of the contextual requirements determines ethical behavior leaves the individual a great deal of leeway. The recognition that situations will call for varied behavior, that what is ethical in one case may not be ethical in another, is valuable to the construction of a workable ethical system but more is needed to help guide individuals in their decisions.

The final ethical school of thought is the dialogical ethic. Several authors argue for the adoption of the dialogical perspective[15] to guide communication behavior.[16] The perspective is based on the writings of Martin Buber and the idea that communication "functions to shape the development of both speaker and auditor."[17] Therefore, we should be concerned with how we shape each other and ethical behavior is that which humanizes others.[18] According to Keller and Brown, "A's communication is ethical to the extent that it accepts (in the sense of implicit psychological acceptance) B's responses; it is unethical to the extent it develops hostility toward B's responses, or in some way tries to subjugate B."[19] Dialogue can enhance the self-determination forces within the other and help the other to become more fully human by treating the other as a human being. Communication, then

should be used to humanize others. Dehumanization, as Daniel Pekarsky explains, need not be clear subjugation but can occur through more subtle means.[20]

As a basis for interpersonal communication ethics a dialogical ethic can encompass the other systems. It provides a direction for communication effectiveness by presenting a worthwhile end to increasing interpersonal skill. It gives a reason for upholding the value of communication and truth or other overriding values by demonstrating how those values humanize others. It gives us a touchstone to evaluate the worth of adhering to rules and a reason for condemning those who selfishly break those rules. The dialogical perspective also gives meaning to the valuable good by which contextual ethics may be tested. Like Johnstone, Keller, and Brown I suggest a dialogical ethic is appropriate for communication in general and for interpersonal communication in particular.

APPLICATION

In the next section of this essay I will outline a series of ethical guidelines appropriate for students who have completed an interpersonal communication course. Since different teachers of interpersonal communication examine and emphasize different topics in their courses the guidelines are intended to be general enough to apply them to the results of all the different courses. They are meant to allow us to ethically evaluate interpersonal communication behavior. Before I present the guidelines I will first explain what I mean by interpersonal communication and by ethical evaluation.

The term interpersonal communication has a wide variety of interpretations within the speech communication discipline.[21] In this essay I consider interpersonal communication a realized opportunity to treat someone as a person or a non-person. This can involve face to face transactions as well as telephone or written communication. It can involve one person talking directly to another, to a group, about another, or about a group. It can also involve people in a long-term, emotionally-committed relationship or a relationship as transitory as ordering dinner from a waitress whom you will never see again. I realize this extends the dialogical ethic beyond Buber's I-Thou relationship. All the situations possible in this definition of interpersonal communication, however, do have humanizing and dehumanizing potential; they have the potential to confirm or disconfirm others. This definition is meant to call attention to the fact that there are many opportunities to treat people as people and communication is interpersonal regardless of its quality. I do not mean to suggest that one must go out of one's way to be interpersonal. Strangers should not rush across the street to encounter someone they've never met. I do mean to suggest that we do engage in more interpersonal communication than we may realize, and should not limit our conception of interpersonal communication to only those that fit the dialogic definition.

The ethical evaluations I have in mind are different from those we may normally expect. Ethics are usally considered in polar terms; something is either right or wrong. Such a polarized perspective is troublesome, though. On one hand it can lead to the recognition of so

much unethical behavior that it seems pointless for a human to worry about ethics because there will always be transgressions. Any standard high enough to be worthwhile is impossible to attain. On the other hand, it may lead to rampant rationalizations to defend questionable behavior as ethical. The results are, then, attempts to avoid unethical actions rather than attempts to behave ethically.

I suggest that we conceive of communication ethics as a continuum. At one end is clearly ethical behavior and at the other is clearly unethical behavior. In between are behaviors that are more ethical than some and less ethical than others. The ethical evaluation is, except for extreme instances, the recognition of the possibility of more ethical communication. This leaves everyone open to improvement rather than the label "unethical." At first this may seem to encourage questionable behavior because explicit standards are not promoted. It is actually more strict than that because, as I shall explain later, it calls for evaluation of all behavior and constant attempts to improve. In practice, acts are usually considered ethical if they are not explicitly prohibited by the standard. If behavior does not seem terribly bad it is considered acceptable and ethical. The difference between the polarized conceptualization of ethics and the conceptualization of this paper is the continuum allows for very few acts to be considered absolutely ethical; most behavior could still be more ethical. Ethics are on a more-or-less dimension rather than an either-or dimension. That which is not explicitly blameworthy is not necessarily as ethical as it could be.

This paper, then, assumes a diologic perspective, and that vir-

tually all interactions (not only those in which the interactants have an on-going relationship) should be considered interpersonal, and that acts can be placed along an ethical continuum. With those assumptions in mind the following are suggested guidelines for ethical interpersonal communication by those who have had instruction in interpersonal communication.

#1: Communication is more ethical when the communicator acknowledges and demonstrates sensitivity to the humanity of all participants.

This guideline is a summary of the dialogic ethic. It calls on communicators to not only recognize the essential humanness of others but also to act on that recognition. Conversly, it calls on the communicators to not only act as if the others are human beings but to also believe they are human. Such acknowledgement and sensitivity should lead the communicator to consider the effect of his/her communication on the other(s) and decide whether it is humanizing or dehumanizing.

It is beyond the scope of this essay to fully explore what behavior humanizes and what dehumanizes. I suggest that people have a sense of what humanizes and what dehumanizes. They may rationalize, ignore, or make excuses for their dehumanizing behavior but they do recognize it. Not always, but in most cases they do. They know when they have violated the Golden Rule, they know when they have treated others shabbiliy, and they know when they can treat people better. I further suggest that the interpersonal communication class can sharpen that sense of what humanizes and what dehumanizes.

That is not to suggest that humanizing is whatever you want it to be. The ethical communicator will be rigorous with her/himself and critically evaluate actions. (S)he will not tell her/himself, "Oh, that really wasn't too bad" when (s)he knows it was bad. Certainly some acts are worse than others; purposefully hurting someone's feelings is worse than hurting them unintentionally through thoughtlessness. That does not excuse thoughtlessness; there is still better, more humanizing, behavior available. The ethical communicator tries to humanize rather than accept excuses that allow for continued dehumanization.

This standard also does not mean the ethical communicator gives no thought to him/herself. It states, ". . . sensitivity to the humanity of all participants." This clause recognizes that (a) humanizing another humanizes the self, (b) dehumanizing others dehumanizes the self, and (c) one can insist on being treated as a human in a manner that does not dehumanize the other.

There are hundreds of examples available to illustrate the difference between humanizing and dehumanizing communication. We often dehumanize by categorizing others and treating them as a member of a group rather than as an individual human being. We do that to children, students, employees, the elderly, sales clerks, customers, etc. A very clear example of how we regularly dehumanize others is the characteristic treatment of mentally handicapped individuals. When they are seen in public they are often stared at, pointed at, giggled at, mimicked, ridiculed, talked about as if they could not understand what is being said, treated as if they are incapable of

making their own decisions about anything, and treated as if they had no feelings. Anyone who would put him/herself in the place of such a person would quickly recognize how dehumanizing apparently normal treatment can be. When Shylock asks if a Jew is not a man like any other he is expressing the fundamental perspective of the dehumanized. People who follow this standard will try to develop their communication skills so they enhance understanding and treat others better.

#2: Those with instruction in interpersonal communication have an ethical responsibility to actively use their knowledge and skills to humanize their relationships with others and to actively avoid dehumanizing others.

This standard clarifies that communication behavior is more ethical when conscious choices to humanize are made by the communicators. A great deal of our communication is habitual and it is too easy to defend dehumanization as simply what one is used to doing. Some of our communication behavior is a result of trying to fit in with a group by acting on their expectations which may include dehumanizing behavior. This standard calls on communicators to think about what they do and to choose a course of action that will be humanizing.

This standard also recognizes that, as a result of taking a class in interpersonal communication, an individul should have more skill and knowledge about the potential effects of communication behavior than he/she would without the class. That creates a responsibility for the individual to use that skill and knowledge for the good. By studying interpersonal communication one may learn, for example, both

how to make people feel good and how to make them feel bad. While one may be tempted to cause emotional hurt to another it would be more ethical to affect the other in no way and more ethical still to attempt to enhance the other's emotional well being. In the event that inaction would likely lead to neither humanization nor dehumanization but an action could lead to humanization it would be more ethical to act than to not act, even though inaction is not absolutely unethical.

For example, it is common to treat service workers as "servants" rather than as people. Many people would not think themselves unethical for treating a waitress curtly or disconfirming[22] her as a person because the customer-waitress relationship allows such treatment. Nevertheless, the customer-waitress relationship can be maintained and, at the same time, both can treat the other as a person with dignity who is deserving of respect and consideration.

#3: Those with instruction in interpersonal communication have the ethical responsibility, when possible, to develop methods to communicate humanely in advance of an encounter.

A common objection to using interpersonal communication skills is the claim that when a difficult situation arises they just do not work. The flaw in the argument is people often do not try to perfect the skills until they are in a difficult situation. Generally our lives run fairly smoothly without using improved communication skills so we do not attempt to improve them until we are involved in a difficult situation. That, of course, is not the time to practice. I suggest that there is a responsibility to prepare in anticipation of

the difficult situations.

This standard also suggests when we approach encounters that we anticipate will be difficult we should think about them to find ways to humanize the transaction. Most of us are used to thinking ahead to plan a strategy that will accomplish our goal but are not used to planning to humanize the relationship. Clearly that is important when dealing with people we care about but it is also important when, for instance, we call the telephone company to complain about service. Students coming out of interpersonal communication classes should have the ability to humanize such a relationship but are rarely told it would be right for them to do so.

#4: Those with instruction in interpersonal communication have the ethical responsibility to continually evaluate specific encounters and their own general style of communication to upgrade their communication abilities and create more humanized relationships.

Rather than simply act and react completely spontaneously those with the knowledge to do so should think about their behavior in specific situations and in general. Everyone can improve their ability to create a humane environment but it does not happen automaticly. Old habits must be broken, thoughtless actions must be considered, and new skills must be developed. Students should not leave an interpersonal communication class believing their abilities have reached their peaks. They should leave knowing they can continue to improve. After specific encounters they should ask themselves "Did I do all I can to humanize that relationship?" If the answer is yes it was a successful

encounter. If the answer is no then they need to ask themselves what they could have done that would be more humanizing and try to do that in the future. They should also periodically take stock of their general communication styles and ask the same questions. They should not, however, simply forget about all their encounters after they happen.

#5: Those with instruction in interpersonal communication have the ethical responsibility to recognize different perceptions of reality and actively attempt to take the perspective of the other.

One common way to dehumanize another is to deny the validity of his/her perspective. One does not have to agree with another to understand why he/she may be seeing things differently. Virtually all interpersonal communication texts emphsize that a major failure in communication is the failure to consider the perspective of the other. Yet it is easy to forget that admonition in an actual encounter. That is why I suggest communicators <u>actively</u> attempt to take perspectives; that they remind themselves often that there are other ways of viewing situations and there are alternative explanations for what is happening. Rather than jump to conclusions it is better to consider the alternatives and find human reasons why another person would behave in an unexpected or unpleasant manner.

#6: Those with instruction in interpersonal communication have the ethical responsibility to avoid making excuses for dehumanizing communication and take responsibility for their actions.

Those with no background in interpersonal communication may claim they do not know when they dehumanize another. They may also take refuge in the excuse that they just do not know better when they dehumanize another. Students of communication, though, should know better. To create more humanized relationships one cannot claim helplessness to excuse dehumanizing behavior. One must search for reasons for less desirable actions, and sometimes those reasons will be valid. Even so, an individual is responsible for his/her actions, the results of those actions, and for improving their actions.

#7: Those with interpersonal communication instruction have the ethical responsibility to actively attempt to recognize and overcome perceptual biases that interfere with humanizing communication.

Everyone has preferences; that which they like and that which they dislike. Too often those preferences serve to classify others and drive us to treat some people as not fully human. Students of communication should be aware of their preferences and make efforts to avoid letting their biases interfere with humanizing relationships. Recognizing those biases will, by itself, not create a humanizing relationship but it is the first step in the process.

An example of a biasing preference is physical appearance. Thomas Steinfatt points out

> People tend to see physical attractiveness as related to most other socially desirable traits. The physically attractive person is perceived to be more warm, sensitive, kind, interesting, strong, modest, and outgoing than the unattractive person. In

> addition, physically attractive men are perceived as less intelligent and less moral than unattractive men, while physically attractive women are perceived as more intelligent and more moral than unattractive women. . . . To summarize, people who are perceived as physically attractive are highly preferred partners for social interaction and are fairly automatically believed to possess most of the other desirable traits. (Emphasis in the original.)[23]

The physical attractiveness bias is dehumanizing in the sense that expectations are created that may have nothing to do with the person in the interaction. It is unrealisitic to expect people to completely disregard physical appearance but it is not unrealistic to expect them to acknowledge their biases and to suspend expectations of others based on appearance. That suspension would allow them to know the other more fully and humanly.

CONCLUSION

As with all standards of ethics these guideline are not easy to follow. All interpersonal communicators are human and are subject to human failings. There simply will be times when they will treat others in a dehumanizing manner. The difference is these guidelines call for people to acknowledge their behavior, take responsibility for it, and improve it. These guidelines assume that people can learn from their mistakes and improve rather than assume they are as they are and base ethical judgement on one action.

These guidelines also withstand the test of Kant's imperitive.

If they became universally practiced interpersonal behavior our interpersonal environment would become more humanizing.

This is only the beginning of the discussion. Much thought needs to be given to the implications and the applications of each standard. How do we show sensitivity to the humanity of others when it may require different acts in different situations? How much respect do we owe those who show us no respect? How often do we turn the other cheek? Are these seven guidelines sufficient? Should the guidelines be revised? These guidelines provide direction but they do not provide a formula that will guarantee ethical action if followed. How to act ethically is a decision that must be made constantly.

NOTES

1 John C. Condon, Jr. Interpersonal Communication. (New York: Macmillan, 1977), p. 202.

2 Texts that include an ethics section are Condon, pp. 181-202; and Joseph A. DeVito, Communicology: An Introduction to the Study of Communication (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), p 17 and pp. 94-107. Texts that do not include specific sections on ethics are: Ronald B. Adler and Neil Town, Looking Out Looking In (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1984); Ronald B. Adler, Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Neil Town, Interplay: The Process of Interpersonal Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983); George A. Borden and John D. Stone, Human Communication: The Process of Relating (Menlo Park, CA: Cummings, 1976); William D. Brooks and Philip Emmert, Interpersonal Communication (Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1976); Charles T. Brown and Paul W. Keller, Monologue to Dialogue: An Exploration of Interpersonal Communication (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973); Jacquelyn B. Carr, Communication and Relating (Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1984); B. Aubrey Fisher, Perspectives on Human Communication (New York: Macmillan, 1978); Mark L. Knapp, Interpersonal Communication and Human Relationship (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974); Sherod Miller, Elam W. Nunnally, and Daniel B. Wackman, Alive and Aware: Improving Communication in Relationships (Minneapolis:

Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc., 1975); Bobby R. Patton and Kim Giffin, (eds.) Interpersonal Communication in Action (New York: Harper & Row, 1977); Judy C. Pearson, Interpersonal Communication: Clarity, Confidence, Concern (Glenview, Il: Scott, Foresman, 1983); Michael E. Roloff, Interpersonal Communication: The Social Exchange Approach (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981); Freda S. Sathrè, Ray W. Olson and Clarissa I. Whitney, Let's Talk: An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1977); Kenneth K. Sereno and Edward M. Bodaken, Trans-Per Understanding Human Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975); Thomas M. Steinfatt, Human Communication: An Interpersonal Introduction (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1977); John R. Stewart (ed.), Bridges Not Walls (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1973); Stewart L. Tubbs and Sylvia Moss, Human Communication (New York: Random House, 1977); Richard L. Weaver II, Understanding Interpersonal Communication (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1979).

3 Sheryl L. Stevenson presents a learning model for interpersonal communication that focuses attention on developing skills that meet the needs of the learner but seems to avoid approaching ethics, although the skills she mentions have implicit ethical foundations. See "Learning Models for Interpersonal Communication Compentency Development," unpublished paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, November 1984.

4 Condon, pp. 181-202.

5 DeVito.

[6] Brown and Keller.

[7] Paul W. Keller, "Interpersonal Dissent and the Ethics of Dialogue," Communication, 6, No. 2 (September 1981), pp. 287-303; Richard W. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication (Prospect Heights, IL: 1983).

[8] Ernest G. Bormann, "Ethical Standards for Interpersonal/Small Group Communication," Communication, 6, No. 2 (September 1981), pp. 267-285.

[9] Frank E. X. Dance, "This Above All." Spectra, 18:11, December 1982, pp. 3-5.

[10] Dance, p. 4.

[11] Dance, p. 4.

[12] Kenneth E. Andersen, "A Code of Ethics for Speech Communication." Spectra, 20:1, January 1984, p. 3.

[13] Ronald C. Arnett, "Ethics of Interpersonal Communication Revisited." A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, November 1981.

[14] Arnett, p. 6.

[15] See Richard L. Johannesen, "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue." The Quarterly Journal of Speech. 57:4, December 1971, pp.373-381; John Poulakos, "The Components of Dialogue." Western Speech. 38:3, Summer 1974, pp. 199-212.

[16] Included in the dialogical school are: Paul W. Keller and Charles T. Brown, "An Interpersonal Ethic for Communication." The Journal of Communication. 18, March 1968, pp. 73-81; Christopher Lyle Johnstone, "Communication and Responsibility: Teaching

Ethics in Human Communication." A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, November 1981; Paul W. Keller, "Interpersonal Dissent and the Ethics of Dialogue." Communication. 6, No. 2 (September 1981), pp. 287-303.

17 Johnstone, p. 6

18 Daniel Pekarsky, "Dehumanization and Education." Journal of Education. 165:1, Winter 1983, pp. 339-353.

19 Keller and Brown, "An Interpersonal Ethic for Communication," p. 76.

20 Pekarsky, pp. 339-353.

21 See Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, p. 91 for a description of some of the meanings.

22 Ronald B. Adler, Communication at Work: Principles and Practices for Business and the Professions (New York: Random House, 1983), pp. 97-100.

23 Steinfatt, p. 181.